

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MAINE

DAVID WIDI, JR., )  
                          )  
Plaintiff,            )  
                          )  
v.                     )       1:11-cv-00113-JAW  
                          )  
                          )  
JUSTICE, U.S. DEPT OF, et al., )  
                          )  
                          )  
Defendants.            )

**ORDER AFFIRMING THE RECOMMENDED DECISION  
OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

March 25, 2011, David J. Widi, Jr. filed a complaint against twenty-four defendants. *Compl.* (Docket # 1). On May 3, 2011, the Magistrate Judge issued an Amended Recommended Decision in which she recommended summary dismissal of the complaint because she concluded it did not survive “the initial screening process under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.” *Am. Recommended Decision* at 9 (Docket # 10). On May 20, 2011, Mr. Widi moved to extend time to file objections to the Recommended Decision, seeking an additional ten days within which to file his objections. *Mot. for Extension of Time* (Docket # 11). On May 23, 2011, the Magistrate Judge granted the motion, extending the time to June 1, 2011. *Order Granting Mot. to Extend Time* (Docket # 12).

Even though Mr. Widi did not file his objection by June 1, 2011, the Court granted a motion that he filed on June 8, 2011, requesting that the time within which he must either object or file an amended complaint be extended by twenty

additional days.<sup>1</sup> *Second Mot. for Extension of Time* (Docket # 13); *Order Granting Mot. to Extend Time* (Docket # 14). In its Order, the Court made it clear that Mr. Widi must “file either an objection to the Recommended Decision or an Amended Complaint no later than July 19, 2011.” *Id.* at 2. July 19th has come and gone and Mr. Widi has failed to comply with the Order. He failed to file either an amended complaint or an objection to the Recommended Decision.

The Court AFFIRMS the Magistrate Judge’s Amended Recommended Decision dated May 3, 2011 (Docket # 10) and DISMISSES David J. Widi, Jr.’s Complaint (Docket # 1) first because he failed to file a timely objection to the Amended Recommended Decision and second because the Court has performed a de novo review of the Amended Recommended Decision and concurs with the United States Magistrate Judge for the reasons set forth in the Amended Recommended Decision.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ John A. Woodcock, Jr.  
JOHN A. WOODCOCK, JR.  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 21st day of July, 2011

---

<sup>1</sup> On June 29, 2011, Mr. Widi filed another motion for leave to file amended complaint. *Mot. for Leave to File Am. Compl.* (Docket # 15). On June 16, 2011, the Magistrate Judge terminated the motion for leave to file amended complaint because the Court had already granted Mr. Widi leave to file an amended complaint. *Order Terminating Mot. for Leave to File Am. Compl.* (Docket # 16).